

**U.S. Department of Education**  
**2009 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program**

---

Type of School: (Check all that apply) ☒ Elementary ☐ Middle ☐ High ☐ K-12 ☐ Other  
☐ Charter ☒ Title I ☐ Magnet ☐ Choice

Name of Principal: Mr. Jeff Rast

Official School Name: Camas County Elementary-Junior High School

School Mailing Address:  
PO Box 370  
610 Soldier Road  
Fairfield, ID 83327-0370

County: Camas State School Code Number\*: 121

Telephone: (208) 764-2472 Fax: (208) 764-9218

Web site/URL: www.camascountyschools.org E-mail: jfrast@D121.k12.id.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Principal's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Superintendent\*: Mr. JT Stroder

District Name: Camas County School District #121 Tel: (208) 764-2472

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Superintendent's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

Name of School Board President/Chairperson: Mr. Claude Ballard

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2 (Part I - Eligibility Certification), and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature) Date \_\_\_\_\_

*\*Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

Original signed cover sheet only should be mailed by expedited mail or a courier mail service (such as USPS Express Mail, FedEx or UPS) to Aba Kumi, Director, NCLB-Blue Ribbon Schools Program, Office of Communications and Outreach, US Department of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., SW, Room 5E103, Washington, DC 20202-8173.

## PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

---

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office for Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes one or more of grades K-12. (Schools on the same campus with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)
2. The school has made adequate yearly progress each year for the past two years and has not been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years.
3. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) requirement in the 2008-2009 school year. AYP must be certified by the state and all appeals resolved at least two weeks before the awards ceremony for the school to receive the award.
4. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, the school must have foreign language as a part of its curriculum and a significant number of students in grades 7 and higher must take the course.
5. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 2003.
6. The nominated school has not received the No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools award in the past five years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, or 2008.
7. The nominated school or district is not refusing OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.
8. OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.
9. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school or the school district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.
10. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

## PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

**DISTRICT** (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of schools in the district:
- |          |                     |
|----------|---------------------|
| 1        | Elementary schools  |
| _____    | Middle schools      |
| _____    | Junior high schools |
| 1        | High schools        |
| _____    | Other               |
| <b>2</b> | <b>TOTAL</b>        |

2. District Per Pupil Expenditure: 13680

Average State Per Pupil Expenditure: 8966

**SCHOOL** (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the school is located:

- ☐ Urban or large central city  
☐ Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area  
☐ Suburban  
☐ Small city or town in a rural area  
☒ Rural

4. 1 Number of years the principal has been in her/his position at this school.

3 If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. Number of students as of October 1 enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	0	0	0	7	6	6	12
K	6	4	10	8	5	5	10
1	10	5	15	9			0
2	8	11	19	10			0
3	7	6	13	11			0
4	7	6	13	12			0
5	10	8	18	Other			0
6	3	7	10				
			<b>TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL</b>				120

6. Racial/ethnic composition of the school: \_\_\_\_\_ % American Indian or Alaska Native  
 \_\_\_\_\_ % Asian  
 \_\_\_\_\_ % Black or African American  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 5 % Hispanic or Latino  
 \_\_\_\_\_ % Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 92 % White  
 \_\_\_\_\_ 3 % Two or more races  
 \_\_\_\_\_ **100 % Total**

Only the seven standard categories should be used in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of your school. The final Guidance on Maintaining, Collecting, and Reporting Racial and Ethnic data to the U.S. Department of Education published in the October 19, 2007 *Federal Register* provides definitions for each of the seven categories.

7. Student turnover, or mobility rate, during the past year: 22 %

This rate is calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.

(1)	Number of students who transferred <b>to</b> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	17
(2)	Number of students who transferred <b>from</b> the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	10
(3)	Total of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)].	27
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1.	122
(5)	Total transferred students in row (3) divided by total students in row (4).	0.221
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100.	22.131

8. Limited English proficient students in the school: 0 %

Total number limited English proficient 0

Number of languages represented: 2

Specify languages:

English, Spanish

9. Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals: 44 %

Total number students who qualify: 53

If this method does not produce an accurate estimate of the percentage of students from low-income families, or the school does not participate in the free and reduced-price school meals program, specify a more accurate estimate, tell why the school chose it, and explain how it arrived at this estimate.

10. Students receiving special education services: 5 %

Total Number of Students Served: 6

Indicate below the number of students with disabilities according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Do not add additional categories.

<u>0</u> Autism	<u>0</u> Orthopedic Impairment
<u>0</u> Deafness	<u>0</u> Other Health Impaired
<u>0</u> Deaf-Blindness	<u>1</u> Specific Learning Disability
<u>0</u> Emotional Disturbance	<u>2</u> Speech or Language Impairment
<u>0</u> Hearing Impairment	<u>0</u> Traumatic Brain Injury
<u>0</u> Mental Retardation	<u>0</u> Visual Impairment Including Blindness
<u>0</u> Multiple Disabilities	<u>3</u> Developmentally Delayed

11. Indicate number of full-time and part-time staff members in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	<u>Full-Time</u>	<u>Part-Time</u>
Administrator(s)	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Classroom teachers	<u>6</u>	<u>2</u>
Special resource teachers/specialists	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>
Paraprofessionals	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Support staff	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Total number	<u>8</u>	<u>7</u>

12. Average school student-classroom teacher ratio, that is, the number of students in the school divided by the Full Time Equivalent of classroom teachers, e.g., 22:1 15 :1

13. Show the attendance patterns of teachers and students as a percentage. Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates. Briefly explain in the Notes section any attendance rates under 95%, teacher turnover rates over 12%, or student dropout rates over 5%.

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Daily student attendance	95%	95%	94%	95%	94%
Daily teacher attendance	91%	90%	93%	89%	89%
Teacher turnover rate	18%	10%	18%	12%	6%

Please provide all explanations below.

Student ADA has been consistent over the last 5 years increasingly slightly. Teacher and student attendance is tied to our remote location. We are about 45 miles from the nearest major services so teachers or students tend to miss an entire day if they have a medical appointment. The turnover rate is also tied to our remote location. About 80% of our staff are teachers or staff members who have been long term members of the community the other 20% are typically staff who move in and then due to the remoteness look to move closer to services.

14. For schools ending in grade 12 (high schools).

Show what the students who graduated in Spring 2008 are doing as of the Fall 2008.

Graduating class size	0	
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	0	%
Enrolled in a community college	0	%
Enrolled in vocational training	0	%
Found employment	0	%
Military service	0	%
Other (travel, staying home, etc.)	0	%
Unknown	0	%
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>%</b>

## PART III - SUMMARY

---

Camas County School District (CCSD) is located on the Camas Prairie in the town of Fairfield. With a student population of less than 200, Camas County School District is able to offer an educational program where everyone can succeed. Despite its small size, CCSD offers a variety of courses and activities. The staff and administration at Camas County are dedicated to student learning as their chief priority. Students are encouraged to achieve to the best of their ability. Educators adjust their teaching methods to address individual learning styles. New and innovative ideas are being investigated. Discipline and leadership programs are enjoying success. These effective teaching and student efforts bring about a continually improving educational system. Our extra curricular activities are well supported – academic, the arts, and sport competitions are encouraged.

Educating children requires a partnership among families, other community members, local businesses and our schools. We all want our children to succeed, and when our children succeed our community succeeds as well. Strong schools build strong communities: Camas County has a long history of pride in its schools and in helping our children grow into productive adults. Through volunteerism, support of school district referenda or just getting to know the children in the community, Camas County residents are active advocates for our schools. Our schools are the hub of the community, and patron involvement is encouraged. With this type of support from all stakeholders, we think our school district is one of the best in the state.

Camas Schools take a holistic approach to learning, believing strongly that "education" must go beyond providing cognitive learning to educating the whole child. Holistic learning places importance on the complete experience of learning and the ways in which the separate parts of the learning experience are interrelated. Often the focus is on the connections in human experience, such as the connections between mind and body or thinking and feeling, relationships between various subject matter, or the individual in society. Teaching methods that complement this type of learning include an interdisciplinary curriculum and brain based research.

In line with educating the whole child, Camas Schools feel that the following types of learning are critical to the experience for the student: cognitive learning involves the mental processes involved in learning, such as remembering and understanding facts and ideas. This type of learning is a primary focus of the core subject curriculum.

Effective learning helps students deal in a positive way with their emotions and values and is the foundation of the emotional growth curriculum. Although cognitive learning and affective learning can occur separately, every effort is made to integrate the two types of learning. The mind stores memories in many ways and everything we learn has emotional connections. In this way, thinking and feeling are interrelated and interdependent.

Character learning teaches students about basic human values including honesty, kindness, generosity, courage, equality, and respect. The goal is to teach students to become morally responsible, self-disciplined adults. Problem solving, decision making, and conflict resolution are important parts of developing responsible behavior as adults. This type of learning is woven through all aspects of the integrated curriculum.

Pursuant to our educational philosophy that endorses educating the whole child, the committee established a set of beliefs that are endorsed by all departments within the school delivering services to children. Increased efforts have been made to familiarize students, staff and parents with the beliefs. These efforts include posting the beliefs in all classrooms and other locations within the school and distributing a copy of the beliefs to staff members in all departments. In addition, an article is planned for a future issue of the parent newsletter Family Matters to explain our beliefs and Mission.

1. All students are capable of learning.
2. An environment that is safe both physically and emotionally promotes student learning.
3. Students learn in different ways and teaching styles should accommodate and respond to learning styles.
4. Students learn best when they are actively engaged and the lesson has personal meaning and value.
5. The educational process is best served when new information is built upon previous learning.
6. Success breeds success.
7. Developing a strong healthy sense of identity is essential to a student's success.
8. Responsibility, Respect, Cooperation, Citizenship, Tolerance and Honesty are key components in an individual's character.
9. The quality of relationships among staff and students is instrumental in developing trust and making a commitment to learning.
10. The character of the teacher is as important as the content of the lesson.

Our Mission is to engage the mind and prepare a student for the rigors of a competitive world.



## PART IV - INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

---

### 1. Assessment Results:

In 2004 we created a ranking chart at the local level which compared grade level assessment results across the entire state. We took the Spring average assessment score for each grade level that was published by the Idaho State Board of Education and then averaged the grade level scores into one to come up with an averaged assessment score for each district in Math, Reading, and Language Usage. We wanted to see where we fit in the big picture of school districts in Idaho. In the 2004 school year the district was ranked 72nd in Language Usage, 53rd in Reading, and 38th in math out of 114 school districts in Idaho. We researched what some of the top schools were doing and implemented several new programs that will be explained later. Our goal was to be in the top ten in each subject area within five years.

In the 2005 school year we saw our state rankings go from 72nd in Language usage to 37th. Math went from 38th to 35th and Reading went from 53rd to 20th. We noticed huge improvements in our Reading and Language Usage but not so much in Math so we started to focus on developing our math remediation groups to a greater extent.

2006 reflected this same trend. We went from 37th in Language usage to 20th. In math our status had improved dramatically from the previous year from 35th to 7th and reading from 20th to 4th. We were shocked that we had cracked the top 10 in Reading and Math in only two years.

2007 continued to reflect these numbers Language Usage had gone to 6th in the state, math stayed at 7th and reading had dropped slightly to 12th. These numbers were still far and above what we had expected and were achieved two years ahead of our timeline.

Idaho had also established AYP proficiency targets in each of these subject areas (<http://www.boardofed.idaho.gov/saa/achievement.asp>). In the 03-04 school year state proficiency targets were at 66% of students to meet proficiency in Reading and Language Usage and 51% in Math. We were barely above those targets in Reading and Language Usage at 68% and 70% respectively, and 74% in Math (historical targets for our school can be found at <http://www.sde.idaho.gov/AYP/default.asp>).

In the 04-05 school year the state raised the targets to 72% in reading and language usage and 60% in math. Our schools reading proficiency was 79%, language usage was 72% and math was 81%. We had added to the pad between state targets and our levels in math and reading but were still close in language usage.

The 05-06 school year reflected tremendous growth in our proficiency targets. Whereas the state targets remained the same in reading our proficiency went to 88% (16 points above state targets) and our math went to 94% (34 percentage points above state targets for math.) Language usage was not published that year as the state changed their indicator for Language to increasing the local Language proficiency target which we did.

In the 06-07 school year the state targets went up again to 78% in reading and language usage and 70% in math. Our schools scores were 88% in reading, 83% in language usage and greater than 95% in math. Reading and math had grown approximately 20% points in that three year period. 07-08 scores reflect the scores from 06-07.

### 2. Using Assessment Results:

When we first began looking at data in 2004 we were using NWEA's Measures of Academic Progress as our state standardized assessment. On the fall test the MAP assessment was an adaptive test meaning that it assessed each student to their highest level of academic skills no matter what grade they were in. This assessment reported back 6-8 categories of assessment within each subject area. It allowed us to target weak

areas within an individual student's skills. For instance a fourth grade student might be strong in spelling and sentence structure but weak in capitalization skills. So we began to analyze each individual student's strengths and weaknesses and we created cross grade level learning groups to address those weak areas. There might be several fourth grade students and a fifth and sixth grade student working on similar skills.

Every fall after the state assessment we would go through the data and organize these groups to remediate those weak skills. And as the years progressed the number of groups needed became fewer.

By the 2005-2006 school year we were introduced to the response to intervention principals which targets students within classrooms and remediate one-on-one with those students and since 06-07 we have used RTI techniques instead of the remediation groups.

We also looked at growth data in those years and noticed that we were not getting one year of academic growth within our language arts curriculum. In the 06-07 school year we researched scientifically based curriculums and adopted and SBR supported language arts curriculum.

What has contributed the most was breaking down each students data and focusing in on the areas where that student lacked skills.

### **3. Communicating Assessment Results:**

Through parent letters from the superintendent and publications posted on our website results of data and explanations of assessments are communicated to parents. We also hold open houses throughout the year and invite parents in to discuss the results of assessments and how they are used. Since we have adopted the Response to Intervention program, parents are invited to sit in with the review committee if their child is being considered for Response to Intervention.

### **4. Sharing Success:**

This is new to us so this piece of the puzzle is still being worked on. One of our obstacles is our remoteness but we are going to use our state level organizations to disseminate information.

The superintendent is planning on working with the state level professional development programs to do seminars on data and what to do with data. This is an area that we are hoping to get some guidance on from our state department or other blue ribbon schools who have been through this process. We have begun the process of involving local media outlets to advertise our success but have not had much response. Again we think this is because of our small size and remote location. We are more than willing to open our doors and share information but do not quite know how to go about it as our intense focus has been internal up to this point.

## PART V - CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION

---

### 1. Curriculum:

The philosophy of the elementary program is to provide a balanced program that emphasizes the importance of mastering basic skills, concepts, and strategies that provide a firm foundation for developing critical thinking, communication, and problem-solving skills. Instruction is designed to meet the learning needs of all children as they strive to meet or exceed the Idaho State Achievement Standards and achieve academic excellence. Within the curriculum are our district graduation goals. The elementary program guides students to reach their academic and creative potential. We are committed to supporting the intellectual, emotional, physical, and social growth of every student in a nurturing and positive learning environment built on respect.

Camas Elementary/JH is organized in a basically traditional classroom arrangement with some variations. Grade levels collaborate on various programs/projects throughout the school year. All classroom teachers grades K-5 emphasize literacy with a 90 minute uninterrupted language arts block. Most subjects are taught by the classroom teacher such as language arts, math, science, and social studies. In addition, students have instruction each week by special teachers in the areas of music, physical education, art, foreign language and media. The main focus in grades K-3 grade is teaching kids how to be exceptional readers. As they progress towards third grade other subjects are included and by the time they reach third grade instruction is delivered in Math, Science, Reading, Music, Social Studies, Physical Education, and Spanish. Spanish is taught K-8 and is a required class by the 8th grade year before they enter HS where more advanced levels of Spanish are taught.

The elementary curriculum is aligned to the Idaho State Learning Standards and the new state-mandated assessments (examinations). The standards define the expectations set for all students. Classroom learning experiences are directly related to the state standards and expectations.

Student achievement is assessed by a combination of individual student work, student projects, teacher observation, formal testing, standardized testing in the Spring, and state assessments. Teachers use assessment data to identify each child's strengths and needs, and to provide information that can be shared with students and parents regarding each student's progress. These evaluations are also used to plan and revise curriculum and instruction.

### 2a. (Elementary Schools) Reading:

The reading curriculum used in the Elementary School is the Reading Street Curriculum published by Scott Foresman. The staff and administration selected this program because of its comprehensiveness and high degree of integration among the various components. It correlates very well with our state standards and has vivid stories. Furthermore, it contains plenty of extra plans for remediation as well as enrichment lending itself to effective differentiation for a wide range of learners. The longest serving teacher in our elementary school remarks that it is the best program she has ever used.

During part of the reading instruction, students read curriculum-based books that suit their skill levels. They read these in break-out sessions with both the classroom teacher and a teacher's aide. The opportunity to read well-suited books stimulates their motivation for reading.

To illustrate the effectiveness of the curriculum, our fourth grade teacher writes, "One of my students is doing independent reading kits that build comprehension. She reads a book of her choice and then answers the questions or does a project that teaches her a specific reading skill like characterization, or predicting, or cause

and effect. She does this all on her own. She loves these projects and continues to be motivated to read on her own. When she completes the project she gets to sit down with me and discuss what she learned. It's very exciting to see a student so motivated that she has done five of these projects in one quarter, while reading other books for enjoyment.

## **2b. (Secondary Schools) English:**

This question is for secondary schools only

## **3. Additional Curriculum Area:**

In the area of mathematics, our school has been using the Saxon math curriculum, which is scheduled to be replaced next year. The Saxon curriculum has been a source of frustration since it takes a pedagogically dubious approach to building math competencies. The curriculum takes what is called an “incremental approach” which works reasonably well as long as all students can maintain similar progress with the curriculum. However, it does not serve struggling students well in that it is not readily adaptable to specific remediation plans.

Our teachers have put in the extra effort to assist struggling students despite the fact that the curriculum does not lend itself well to remedial support. Fortunately, we enjoy a high teacher to student ratio and a very dedicated faculty which makes all the difference.

Given that math literacy is second only to reading literacy in equipping students to succeed in the world, we will be replacing our math curriculum this summer. Our district Math Standards and Curriculum Committee has identified two curricula that should serve our district educational goals far more effectively. The two curricula being considered both build continuity with what we use at the secondary level in our district. Furthermore, both curricula are structured to accommodate differentiation and remediation. Either selection will serve us well.

Regardless of the quality of the curriculum selected, though, the strength of our math instruction will still rest on the shoulders of dedicated and innovative teachers who can provide sufficient individual student attention as a result of our small teacher to student ratio.

## **4. Instructional Methods:**

Data drives differentiation decisions in Camas Elementary. In addition to regular classroom assessments, we also use data from the Idaho Reading Indicator (IRI) and the Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) test.

We also systematically screen all K-3 students throughout the year using Dibels to determine which students are not meeting key literacy benchmarks. The Dibels data has become more important to us given a recent change in the IRI test which seems to reward reading speed over comprehension. The Dibels data provides us with specific direction regarding needed remediation and intervention for struggling students and helps us to ensure that they stay on track once they meet the critical benchmarks.

Students are given individual attention by the classroom teacher and/or a classroom aide. We are also making use of volunteers, especially at the Kindergarten through second grade levels. The individualized work is targeted to address deficiencies identified through the Dibels assessment and embedded curriculum

assessments. Struggling students are tested more frequently to allow for more fluid and appropriate remediation.

On a broader scale, our reading curriculum has a variety of activities for each unit. All students do the same whole group activities. During small group and individual time, students use skill-appropriate level readers. Other differentiation activities include internet inquiry, computer-based applications such as Lexia or Plato or listening to audio text.

Fourth and Fifth grade teachers have use a variety of means to teach geography and history. The fourth grade teacher has her students working on creating a “living museum” for Idaho which will be featured at our Academic Fair this spring. The fifth grade teacher has her students corresponding with students from all 50 states to learn about other parts of our nation.

## **5. Professional Development:**

At Camas Elementary/JH professional development is a commitment shared and informed by all members of the teaching community. Teacher preparation is viewed as a life-long process that fosters the development of a "community of leaders and learners" in which teaching and learning are reciprocal and each member receives from and provides support to others. Each teacher participates in a variety of methods and programs for personal and professional growth all of which have the common focus on equity and long-term student achievement. Most aspects of the professional development opportunities at Camas include both optional and mandatory components. We have a Peer Mentoring program for new teachers that utilizes the expertise from neighboring districts and teachers who have at least 20+ years in education. This is a two year program that is required for all new teachers. We also utilize an academic peer network internally across disciplines and grade levels where teachers meet on a regular basis and share successes and ideas for enhancing learning.

Learning opportunities are diverse and emphasize effective research and exemplary practice in advancing the achievement of low income learners who have historically underperformed in school. Our professional development takes place in a variety of context: seminars, institutes, grade level collaboration, cross grade level articulation, and formal and informal opportunities for coaching and action research inequity pedagogy. We also tap into the ongoing external expertise of consultants and guest researchers who focus on multicultural education, standards based curriculum design and assessment, literacy development and research on academic achievement in critical subject areas.

## **6. School Leadership:**

In 2004 the new principal came on board and encouraged using data and setting up the remediation groups. There is a team composed of the principal, special education director, and Title I director who analyze the data when it becomes available and organizes remediation. This same group is also now the majority of the Response to Intervention group which includes several teachers. As members of the team have become more familiar with using and analyzing data the principal has given them the reigns more as he moved into the Superintendent role. The new part time principal has set continued high expectations and is very collaborative in his approach to student learning. He organized literacy teams at the K-2 and the 3-5 level to continuously analyze data and methods to make sure that our students meet high expectations.

## PART VII - ASSESSMENT RESULTS

### STATE CRITERION-REFERENCED TESTS

Subject: Mathematics Grade: 3 Test: Idaho Standards Achievement Test  
 Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of Education Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	77	100	90	86	67
All Students	54	73	60	21	22
Number of students tested	13	11	10	14	9
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	82
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	80	100	75	67	60
Economically Disadvantaged	60	50	25	17	20
Number of students tested	5	4	4	6	5
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	80	0	90	86	67
White	60	0	60	21	22
Number of students tested	10	0	10	14	9
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	77	100	100	86	100
Students without Disabilities	54	70	67	21	33
Number of students tested	13	10	9	14	6
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	75	100	100	100	75
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	50	86	83	25	25
Number of students tested	8	7	6	8	4

Notes:

Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.



Subject: Reading

Grade: Test: Idaho Standard Achievement  
3 Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of  
Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	62	91	90	79	56
All Students	46	55	80	36	11
Number of students tested	13	11	10	14	9
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	82
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	60	75	75	50	40
Economically Disadvantaged	60	25	50	50	0
Number of students tested	5	4	4	6	5
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	70	0	90	79	56
White	50	0	80	36	11
Number of students tested	10	0	10	14	9
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	62	90	100	79	83
Students without Disabilities	46	60	89	36	17
Number of students tested	13	10	9	14	6
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	63	100	100	100	75
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	38	71	100	25	25
Number of students tested	8	7	6	8	4

Notes:

Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.



Subject: Mathematics

Grade: Test: Idaho Standard Achievement  
4 Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of  
Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	88	100	100	88	100
All Students	29	30	56	13	100
Number of students tested	17	10	9	8	8
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	100	67	100
Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	50	0	100
Number of students tested	4	5	2	3	1
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	88	0	100	88	100
White	31	0	56	13	100
Number of students tested	16	0	9	8	8
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	100	100	100	86	100
Students without Disabilities	33	30	56	14	100
Number of students tested	15	10	9	7	8
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	85	100	100	100	100
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	38	60	57	20	100
Number of students tested	13	5	7	5	7

Notes:

Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.



Subject: Reading

Grade: Test: Idaho Standard Achievement  
4 Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of  
Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	82	80	100	63	100
All Students	35	50	56	25	75
Number of students tested	17	10	9	8	8
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	100
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	75	60	100	33	100
Economically Disadvantaged	50	20	50	0	0
Number of students tested	4	5	2	3	1
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	88	0	100	63	100
White	31	0	56	25	75
Number of students tested	16	0	9	8	8
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	87	80	100	71	100
Students without Disabilities	40	50	56	29	75
Number of students tested	15	10	9	7	8
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	85	100	100	80	100
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	31	80	57	40	86
Number of students tested	13	5	7	5	7

Notes:

Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: Test: Idaho Standard Achievement  
5 Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of  
Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	100	100	100	89	0
All Students	50	42	40	44	0
Number of students tested	10	12	5	9	0
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	0
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	100	50	0
Economically Disadvantaged	0	40	33	0	0
Number of students tested	3	5	3	2	0
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	100	0	100	89	0
White	50	0	40	44	0
Number of students tested	10	0	5	9	0
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	100	100	100	89	0
Students without Disabilities	50	42	40	44	0
Number of students tested	10	12	5	9	0
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	100	100	0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	71	43	50	57	0
Number of students tested	7	7	2	7	0

Notes:

Grade 5 was not tested in the 03-04 year. Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 5 Test: Idaho Standard Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	100	92	80	89	0
All Students	60	33	40	56	0
Number of students tested	10	12	5	9	0
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	0
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	100	80	67	50	0
Economically Disadvantaged	0	20	33	50	0
Number of students tested	3	5	3	2	0
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	100	0	80	89	0
White	60	0	40	56	0
Number of students tested	10	0	5	9	0
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	100	92	80	89	0
Students without Disabilities	60	33	40	56	0
Number of students tested	10	12	5	9	0
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	100	100	0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	86	43	50	57	0
Number of students tested	7	7	2	7	0

Notes:

Grade 5 was not tested in the 03-04 year. Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: Test: Idaho Standard Achievement  
6 Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of  
Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	92	88	100	86	0
All Students	33	38	67	0	0
Number of students tested	12	8	9	7	0
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	0
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	100	75	100	50	0
Economically Disadvantaged	33	25	50	0	0
Number of students tested	3	4	2	2	0
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	92	0	100	86	0
White	33	0	67	0	0
Number of students tested	12	0	9	7	0
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	92	88	100	80	0
Students without Disabilities	33	38	67	0	0
Number of students tested	12	8	9	5	0
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	89	100	100	100	0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	33	50	71	0	0
Number of students tested	9	4	7	5	0

Notes:

Grade 6 was not tested in the 03-04 year. Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.

Subject: Reading

Grade: 6 Test: Idaho Standard Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	92	88	89	100	0
All Students	42	38	67	29	0
Number of students tested	12	8	9	7	0
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	0
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	100	75	50	100	0
Economically Disadvantaged	0	25	0	50	0
Number of students tested	3	4	2	2	0
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	92	0	89	100	0
White	42	0	67	29	0
Number of students tested	12	0	9	7	0
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	92	88	89	100	0
Students without Disabilities	42	38	67	40	0
Number of students tested	12	8	9	5	0
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	89	100	100	100	0
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	56	50	86	20	0
Number of students tested	9	4	7	5	0

Notes:

Grade 6 was not tested in the 03-04 year. Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: 7 Test: Idaho Standard Achievement Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	100	93	100	73	69
All Students	67	53	11	18	38
Number of students tested	9	15	9	11	16
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	94
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	80	100	100	100	50
Economically Disadvantaged	40	100	50	0	33
Number of students tested	1	4	3	4	6
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	100	0	100	73	69
White	63	0	11	18	38
Number of students tested	8	0	9	11	16
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	100	93	100	70	77
Students without Disabilities	67	57	17	20	46
Number of students tested	9	14	6	10	13
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	100	91	100	57	80
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	63	55	17	0	40
Number of students tested	8	11	6	7	10

Notes:

Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.



Subject: Reading

Grade: Test: Idaho Standard Achievement  
7 Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of  
Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	89	100	89	73	44
All Students	44	60	44	27	31
Number of students tested	9	15	9	11	16
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	94
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	67	100	33
Economically Disadvantaged	0	50	33	75	33
Number of students tested	1	4	3	4	6
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	88	0	89	73	44
White	38	0	44	27	31
Number of students tested	8	0	9	11	16
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	89	100	83	70	54
Students without Disabilities	44	57	50	30	38
Number of students tested	9	14	6	10	13
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	88	100	100	57	50
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	50	64	50	0	30
Number of students tested	8	11	6	7	10

Notes:

Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.

Subject: Mathematics

Grade: Test: Idaho Standard Achievement  
8 Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of  
Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	100	100	80	76	67
All Students	69	27	30	29	14
Number of students tested	16	11	10	17	21
Percent of total students tested	94	100	100	100	95
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	86	67	63
Economically Disadvantaged	60	25	43	17	0
Number of students tested	5	4	7	6	8
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	100	0	80	76	67
White	67	0	30	29	14
Number of students tested	15	0	10	17	21
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	100	100	88	81	82
Students without Disabilities	67	33	38	31	18
Number of students tested	15	9	8	16	17
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	67	82	69
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	73	29	0	36	23
Number of students tested	11	7	3	11	13

Notes:

Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.

Subject: Reading

Grade: Test: Idaho Standard Achievement  
8 Test

Edition/Publication Year: Idaho State Department of  
Education

Publisher: Idaho State Department of Education

	2007-2008	2006-2007	2005-2006	2004-2005	2003-2004
Testing Month	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr	Apr
<b>SCHOOL SCORES</b>					
All Students	94	82	80	82	76
All Students	71	27	40	53	38
Number of students tested	17	11	10	17	21
Percent of total students tested	100	100	100	100	95
Number of students alternatively assessed					
Percent of students alternatively assessed					
<b>SUBGROUP SCORES</b>					
<b>1. Free and Reduced Lunch/Socio-Economic Disadvantaged Students</b>					
Economically Disadvantaged	83	50	86	67	63
Economically Disadvantaged	50	25	57	17	25
Number of students tested	6	4	7	6	8
<b>2. Racial/Ethnic Group (specify subgroup): White</b>					
White	100	0	80	82	76
White	73	0	40	53	38
Number of students tested	15	0	10	17	21
<b>3. (specify subgroup): Students without Disabilities</b>					
Students without Disabilities	100	89	88	88	82
Students without Disabilities	73	33	38	56	47
Number of students tested	15	9	8	16	17
<b>4. (specify subgroup): Non-Economically Disadvantaged</b>					
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	100	100	67	91	85
Non-Economically Disadvantaged	82	29	0	73	46
Number of students tested	11	7	3	11	13

Notes:

Data for the White subgroup was lost in the Spring 06-07.

The State of Idaho changed assessments in the Spring of 2007.

----- **END OF DOCUMENT** -----